

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the official action dated August 8, 2008 (hereafter, the "official action"). This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our credit card in the amount of the requisite fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith, to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 29610/CDT337.

All pending claims 1-16 have been rejected. Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, and 12 have been rejected as anticipated by International (PCT) Patent Publication No. WO 2004/004421 A2 to Bechtel et al. ("Bechtel"). Claims 3, 7-9, 11, 15, and 16 have been rejected as obvious over Bechtel in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0234609 A1 to Aziz et al ("Aziz"). Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected as obvious over Bechtel in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0127971 A1 to Hofstra et al. ("Hofstra"). Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected as obvious over Bechtel in view of both Aziz and Hofstra.

CLAIM REJECTIONS -- 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, and 12 have been rejected as anticipated by Bechtel. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, and 12 are directed to an OLED comprising a substrate bearing a light emitting layer between an electrically conducting anode and an electrically conducting cathode, wherein said cathode incorporates an optical interference structure configured to enhance light transmission through said cathode at said emission wavelength.

The applicants respectfully submit that the examiner's characterization of Bechtel as teaching that the "cathode incorporates an optical interference structure configured to enhance light transmission through said cathode at said emission wavelength" at paragraph 5 of the official action is incorrect. Bechtel merely teaches OLED-based display devices in which transparent dielectric layers 5 are external to and layered upon a transparent cathode 4 (*see* Bechtel at Fig. 1). Bechtel therefore does not teach an optical interference structure incorporated in the cathode (i.e., an optical interference structure being within the cathode structure itself). Accordingly, the anticipation rejections over Bechtel should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS -- 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11, and 13-16 have been rejected as variously obvious over Bechtel in view of Aziz and/or Hofstra. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As discussed above, Bechtel merely teaches OLED-based display devices in which transparent dielectric layers 5 are external to and layered upon a transparent cathode 4 (*see* Bechtel at Fig. 1). According to Bechtel, this configuration is advantageous because “[t]he actual manufacturing process of the electroluminescent device remains unchanged because the transparent dielectric layers are provided only at the end of the process” (*see* Bechtel at p. 2, lines 23-25). Thus, Bechtel teaches away from and thus also fails to suggest incorporating an interference structure into a cathode or other electrode because, for example, incorporating such a structure into the cathode or other electrode would necessarily change the manufacturing process.

Neither Aziz nor Hofstra remedies the foregoing deficiency.

For example, the charge injection region 2052 in Aziz which was referenced by the examiner is not analogous to an optical interference structure or spacer layer, as recited in the pending claims.

Additionally, Hofstra teaches a device which emits through the anode, but fails to teach a multi-layered anode. Thus, one of ordinary skill would hardly be motivated by the teachings of Hofstra to incorporate an optical interference structure or spacer layer, as recited in the pending claims, into an anode.

In view of the above comments, the applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be sustained.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, she is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

February 9, 2009

/Andrew M. Lawrence/
Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130
Attorney for Applicants
6300 Sears Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300